

**Remarks**

The non-final Office Action dated March 6, 2008 listed the following rejections: claims 2 and 12 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 112(2); claim 19 stands rejected under U.S.C. § 101; claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 102(e) over Doerenberg (U.S. Patent No. 6,467,003); and claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under U.S.C. § 103(a) over Doerenberg. The specification is objected to due to informalities.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 112(2) rejection of claims 2 and 12 because explicit antecedent basis for claim terms is not required. *See, e.g.*, M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e). Notwithstanding, in an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 2 and 12 to replace the word “another” with the word “an.” Thus, Applicant requests that the § 112(2) rejection of claims 2 and 12 be withdrawn.

In response to the § 101 rejection of claim 19, Applicant has amended claim 19 in such a manner that renders the rejection moot as indicated on page 7 of this paper. Thus, Applicant requests that the § 101 rejection of claim 19 be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the § 102(e) of claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19 and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 18 (each of which is based upon the Doerenberg reference) because the cited portions of Doerenberg do not correspond to the claimed invention which includes, for example, nodes of the cold start type. The Office Action cites to parts of the Doerenberg reference relate to bus interface controllers (BIC) 108 and 110; however, the cited portions of Doerenberg do not mention that the BICs 108 and 100 are cold state type nodes or that they are part of any such cold start nodes, which perform a start operation of a communication system. *See, e.g.*, Figure 2, Col. 6:22 to Col. 7:48. Rather, the cited portions of Doerenberg do not teach using any such nodes to perform a start operation of a communication system. *See, e.g.*, Col. 6:23 to Col. 7:48 and Col. 13:19-46. In fact a word search of the Doerenberg reference reveals that Doerenberg makes no mention of anything relating to nodes that perform a cold start operation of a communication system. In an effort to facilitate prosecution, Applicant has amended the claims to recite aspects relating to the cold state nodes, for example, the cold start nodes perform a cold-start operation of the communication system responsive to a start signal received via the channels. These amendments are not intended to change the scope of the claims, as the skilled artisan would have recognized that these aspects were already

implicitly present. *See, e.g.*, Paragraphs 0011 and 0040 or Applicant's Specification. Applicant submits that the cited portions of the Doerenberg reference do not teach or suggest cold start nodes that perform a cold-start operation of the communication system as in the claimed invention. Accordingly, the § 102(e) of claims 1-9, 11-17 and 19 and the § 103(a) rejection of claims 10 and 18 are improper and Applicant requests that they be withdrawn.

In response to the objection to the specification, Applicant has amended the specification to remove the references to specific claim numbers as indicated on page 2 of this paper. Thus, Applicant requests that the objection to the specification be removed.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections/objections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the agent overseeing the application file, Peter Zawilska, of NXP Corporation at (408) 474-9063.

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
NXP Intellectual Property & Standards  
1109 McKay Drive; Mail Stop SJ41  
San Jose, CA 95131  
CUSTOMER NO. 65913

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Name: Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No.: 32,122  
(NXPS.501PA)